

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AREA STUDY
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

MONTHLY REPORT #4
SEPTEMBER 2001

PREPARED FOR:
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ZONING

PREPARED BY:
DUANY PLATER-ZYBERK & COMPANY

STUDY TEAM:
PATRICIA BIDOL-PADVA, DEBRA CHILDS, ROBERT FREILICH, MARINA KHOURY, DOUGLAS KRIEGER, MICHAEL LAUER,
ELIZABETH PLATER-ZYBERK, TYSON SMITH, PAUL TISCHLER & IAN WATSON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TASKS	1
MEETING MINUTES (AUGUST 2001)	2
MONTHLY ACTIVITIES BY CONSULTANT	7
SUITABILITY CRITERIA - Update	9

1. ONGOING TASKS (this month)

TASK 1: INVENTORY & ANALYSIS

Task 1a: Environmental & Physical Analysis of Agricultural Land Use Practices

Task 1b: Agriculture and Agribusiness Update (UF under separate contract)

TASK 3: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Task 3a: Citizens' Advisory Committee

Task 3b: Related Studies Coordination

2. COMPLETED TASKS

NONE

3. NEW TASKS (beginning at month 5)

Task 1f: Fiscal Impact (DouglasKrieger's sub-task only)

MEETING MINUTES

AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL AREA STUDY, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

Cooperative Extension, 18710 SW 288th Street, Homestead, Florida

August 16th 2001

Board Members Present

Craig Wheeling (Chairman)
Ron Weeks (Vice-Chairman)
Ivonne Alexander
John Alger
Erin Deady – new member representing the Audubon Society
Santiago Garcia
Bill Losner
Cooper McMillan
Reed Olszack
James Pierce
Karsten Rist
Erik Tietig

Board Members Absent

Noble Hendrix
Santiago Iglesias
Phil Marraccini
Brent Probinsky

Minutes

I. Call to Order

- Craig Wheeling called the meeting to order at 6:35pm.
- The UF team present at the meeting introduced themselves: Dr. Bob Degner, Tom Stevens and David Mulkey
- Jerry Bell introduced Erin Deady, who would be replacing Dr. Mark Kraus as the National Audubon Society Representative effective September 13. He noted that she was welcome to participate in discussion, although not to vote until her appointment by the Board of County Commissioners became official. He also acknowledged Technical Advisory Committee members in the audience: Don Pybas from the Miami-Dade Cooperative Extension Service; Julie Baker, sitting in for Judy Nothdurft from the Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management; Karyn Ferro from the National Park Service; Christine Coffin from the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service; and Dr. Chuck Blowers, Research Chief for the Miami-Dade Department of Planning and Zoning.

II. Approval of Agenda and Meeting Minutes

- A motion was passed to move Item V. "Update on UF components of Task 1a. to Item III. on the agenda.
- Item III. "Presentation by National Park Service Representative on Everglades Restoration Issues" was deferred to another meeting because the person designated to make the presentation was out of town and could not attend. No exact date was set.
- The agenda was then approved unanimously.
- The meeting minutes were approved. However a CAC member asked why his concerns expressed at the last meeting about the methodology used for the suitability criteria were not noted.
- Another member said that some items and issues raised at the previous meeting were also not noted and posed a general question about what format the Meeting Minutes should have. A request that the Minutes be transcribed verbatim was turned down since it is the Consultant's responsibility to only provide a summary, and because a member noted that in some cases it is difficult to understand what people are saying on the meeting tapes. A suggestion that objections or additions to the minutes to be provided by members and attached as an appendix to the minutes was also rejected due to a lack of time. After further discussion, the following was agreed to:
 - o A statement shall be made at the end of each Meeting Minutes Summary that a full record of meetings will be made available to the Committee through the tapes.
 - o Meeting tapes will be made available to the Committee in the Cooperative Extension Service library.
 - o Copies of these tapes shall be made available upon request.

III. UF's Presentation: Update on UF Components

- Dr. Degner listed the objectives for their components of the Study, which are being conducted under separate contract with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. These objectives mirror the objectives in the scope of services for the County's Agriculture and Rural Area Study, and are as follows: 1) to collect and analyze data for the long-run economic outlook of agriculture; and 2) to develop recommendations to enhance agriculture's economic viability.
- A list of their research team members and their areas of expertise was presented.
- The circular communication loop between UF and DPZ and their sub-consultants was emphasized. (To date, a number of maps have been provided by UF to URS).
- A list of study goals was outlined:
 - o Identify the environmental and physical attributes and parameters that affect crops.
 - o Use GIS to create maps to show relationships between physical attributes and crop requirements.
 - o Examine current and future political and economic environments affecting Miami-Dade agriculture.
- Specific objectives were listed:
 - o Evaluate environmental constraints
 - o Evaluate technical development
 - o Evaluate structural changes
 - o Evaluate international trade challenges.
 - o Look at governmental policies on labor, crop insurance, water use, flood and wetlands protection.
 - o Review market development strategies.
 - o Review infrastructure needs and policy concerns of farmers and agribusiness.
- He outlined UF's progress to date on economic outlook:

o Economic impact	100% complete
o Development of agriculture database	99%

- Physical production parameters 100%
- Technical development 99%
(new cultivars, cultural practices, pesticides, irrigation management, fertilization, robotics & post harvest)
- Profitability issues 75%
- Structural changes in food distribution 90%
- Govt. policies on crop insurance & farm labor 80%
- Domestic market development 90%
- International trade issues 75%
- Communications infrastructure assessments 100%
- Infrastructure needs and policy concerns 80%
- For structural changes in food distribution they looked at changes in large food retailers consolidations, changes in produce sales, branding of products, etc...
- For international trade, they looked at general trends in global trade patterns, trade agreements (Caribbean Trade Initiatives (CBI), North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA)), other countries abilities to produce, potential for large scale production, macroeconomic issues, etc...
- UF believes that profitability is the key to agricultural retention and they looked at different profitability tables / acres of different crops.
- Mr. Stevens's presentation was on infrastructure needs and policy concerns
 - 10,000 surveys were mailed to people, about 330 were returned
 - 120 from fruit growers 20% farms / 80% acreage
 - 46 from vegetables growers 34% farms / 56% acreage
 - 147 from nurseries 26% farms / 34% acreage
 - The surveys were also published in newspapers in English and Spanish
 - The objective was not only sampling, but to conduct a canvas.
 - The survey ratings described the impact of a variety of issues on the different crops .
(e.g.: local land-use regulations, pesticide regulations, flood control policies, crop insurance programs, APHIS services, trade policy, retail farmers markets, domestic market production, law enforcement services,)
- . The IFAS team is currently reviewing the draft Report and expected to submit their comments by Nov. 1st.
- Some GIS deliverables have already been provided to the DPZ team.
- The final Report will be issued on December 31st, 2001. UF prefers to issue the Report in its entirety at that time.
- A CAC member challenged the accuracy of the potato and corn data and indicated that his experience as a farmer was exactly contrary to the results reported.
- The Chairman asked UF if the CAC would be provided with an opportunity to review their draft Report before it was finalized, and UF answered no. Several members expressed concern about a non-industry group turning out a report without industry feedback. Chairman Wheeling temporarily turned over the chairmanship to the Vice-Chairman.
- Chairman Wheeling noted that using statistics without allowing an opportunity for the community to comment is problematic, and can result in the entire study being flawed. The Chairman indicated that there may be problems with the underlying data due to voluntary participation by farmers. As an example, he advised that in the past Brooks Tropicals did not participate in a State of Florida survey in order to maintain the confidentiality of key data about the high profitability of limes. He noted that this information was later provided to the State as part of the citrus canker damage assessment, and that Brooks Tropical fully cooperated with the University of Florida's surveys and data requests. Bob

Degner concurred that Brooks Tropicals has provided extensive input in the Report.

- One member indicated that the University of Florida was chosen to do the study and should only have to provide the CAC with a finished product. The member indicated that he was distressed that Brooks Tropical had not cooperated with the UF Report.
- UF stated that their data presented is the best possible based on the information provided to them and USDA and State industry data. They are basing their study on the belief that they obtained objective data. They cannot be held accountable for the fact that some farmers did not participate in the study and have to operate on the premise that the data given to them was truthful and accurate. They cannot submit the Report to the CAC for editing because each time a draft would be produced, more edits would be made and the process would never end.
- A CAC member stated that if the UF Report can be improved in any way, it should be even if it means allowing comments to their draft. Another member suggested they wait until the final Report is submitted before they provide comments since it would otherwise become a never-ending process.
- Prospective member Erin Deady outlined the difference between providing feedback versus editing. It was suggested that they have a mechanism in place that could improve the Report – a three-part step which would include:
 - o An analysis of the data
 - o A potential suggestion for additional data
 - o Recommendations of where that information could be obtained.
- Lee Rawlinson, Miami-Dade County Assistant Director for Planning, advised that the County had worked closely with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) during the contract negotiation process to ensure that the CAC would have an opportunity to comment on the University of Florida's component of the Study, and that provisions for such review were included in UF's contract with FDACS. He suggested that the CAC contact UF and FDACS and request UF submit a draft to them before the Report is finalized.
- A CAC member reiterated that it is important not to mislead local agriculturalists into farming crops that appear to be profitable in the Report but that are actually not profitable. This could result in overall less profits for the farmers altogether.
- DPZ stated that there will be opportunities for the CAC to review and comment on the consultants' work throughout the Study. DPZ's consultants will present their methodology to the CAC at the outset of each task, and a draft of their deliverables for comments prior to finalization. Discussion, feedback, and two-way communication can and should occur throughout the Study process.
- The CAC expressed their respect and praise for UF's work on this report, and reiterated the fact that UF and IFAS are highly respected in the South Miami-Dade community. They did not want UF under the impression that their comments were derogatory and are aware of UF's expertise and professional integrity. Members of the CAC reiterated that it was due to their insistence that UF was hired to produce this Report and participate in the Study.

IV: Update by DPZ

- DPZ outlined for the CAC the adjustments that have been made to the Schedule of Services due to the timeframe with which information is becoming available. The 18-month time frame for the study has not changed.
- DPZ reassured the CAC that the suitability criteria factors, ranking system and initial results presented at last month's meeting was preliminary and that adjustments would continue as the scope is further defined. The CAC and TAC will continue to be actively involved in the development and refinement of these criteria, and discussions with the sub-consultants are anticipated at subsequent meetings.
- In reference to specific consultants work:
 - o Douglas Krieger will attend September's meeting to discuss his methodology with the CAC for his focus group work (Task 1f).

- Paul Tischler's methodology will also be presented to the CAC at the September or October's meeting (Task 1c)
 - Freilich, Leitner and Carlisle will be presenting their methodology for their numerous tasks at the October meeting.
- At the request of the Chairman, DPZ briefly described Task 1c – Economic Outlook. As specified in the contract, the majority of Task 1c. is being conducted by the University of Florida under their separate contract with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Tischler and Associates is conducting a portion of this work, an analysis of projected land values in the Study Area. This work is dependent on information about the amount of land in the Study Area that is projected to remain in agriculture that is to be provided by the County.
- DPZ informed the CAC that the related studies already submitted for Task 3b had been handed out to the TAC for their review and that they (TAC and CAC) had until September 30th to add any additional studies to the list. DPZ will assume that the format in which they were presented to the CAC in the June Report is acceptable unless told otherwise. Some studies will only be listed while others will have a brief description. Full copies of the studies will be made available to the CAC for further in-depth readings.

V: Other Business

- A CAC member asked Jerry Bell to make sure they are only required to file one disclosure form, even if they serve on more than one Board. He advised that they are only required to fill out one form. The member provided him with a copy of a letter she had received from the Elections Department advising that she had not filed, even though she already had filed for another Board. He advised that he would look into it for her.
- Another member requested that the CAC be provided with an opportunity to revisit the suitability criteria. DPZ assured them that they would have other opportunities to review the suitability criteria with the consultants.

VI: Public Comment

- None
- The next meeting is set for 09-20-01.
- It was suggested that it would be a nice gesture for the CAC to send a thank you card to their guest lecturers. This idea was approved and adopted by the CAC.
- The meeting was adjourned at 8:40pm.

This is only a summary of the CAC meeting that occurred in August 16th, 2001. If more detailed information is requested, please contact Jerry Bell, the County Project Manager for a copy of the tapes made during the

Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company (DPZ)

During the month of August and beginning September, DPZ coordinated the on-going tasks between the various consultants in order to ensure the following: 1) make sure work is obtained and completed in a timely manner, according to the schedule; and 2) review consultant's deliverables. DPZ attended the first TAC meeting, as well as the fourth CAC meeting and produced meeting minutes for the CAC meeting. DPZ also produced the monthly report.

DPZ is in the process of compiling a list of all related studies (federal, state, municipal and county projects) that could impact our study area. DPZ has also been in contact with the majority of the TAC Board and has asked for their assistance in reviewing the related studies list already submitted as well as their expertise and recommendations for additional studies that could impact our study area. A list and brief summary of studies were presented to the CAC for their review and comments in the June report. The deadline for additional related projects recommended by the TAC and CAC to be included is September 30th.

URS

URS has been working on the following tasks:

Data collection - 95% completed

URS has received the following data listed below from FPL and is in the process of reviewing it and preparing it for use in the study:

- Current Zoning
- Future Zoning
- Parcels
- Conservation Lands
- Aerial Photos at both one foot and reduced resolution
- Utility Easements (Requested as part of the data package from FPL)
- Proposed boundaries for incorporated Redlands

Maps - 75% complete

Revisions will be made to draft maps based on CAC comments.

Suitability Analysis/Model - 25-40% complete

They are awaiting additional feedback about the suitability criteria in order to apply them to the model. Criteria will be further assessed for inclusion in the analysis.

Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle / Planning Works

Tyson Smith, an attorney with Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle, is continuing to work with Jerry Bell, the Project Manager, and Marina Khoury, of DPZ, in performing Task 3b- Related Studies Coordination; and specifically to ensure that the ongoing review of related studies is comprehensive in scope and includes previously-performed analyses that bear directly on the work of the Consultants and the County. Be reminded that all parties should have suggested studies to be reviewed under this task to Marina Khoury, DPZ, not later than September 30, 2001.

Additionally, Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle is preparing to begin Task 1f, Public Sector Fiscal Impact Analysis; which will be performed between September of 2001 and July of 2002, and will involve extensive input from a range of participating consultants. Both Robert Freilich and Tyson Smith will attend the October 18th meeting of the CAC to discuss on-going and upcoming tasks and to give an overview of future tasks to be performed over the duration of the Study.

Tischler & Associates

Paul Tischler has been developing his approach and methodology for Task 1C- Economic Outlook and refining it with DPZ and the County prior to his presentation of it to the CAC. His approach will be to calculate the likely aggregate sales prices in 2001 dollars of the land under the different land use types as noted in the scope of services - Agricultural Zoning, Land at the Urban Fringe (1 dwelling unit / 5 acres) and Suburban Residential Use (3-6 units / acre). This aggregate amount will be a function of the information received from the County Project Manager who will be providing "*a schedule of the amount of land that is now, and is expected to be, in agricultural use in 2010, 2020 and 2050*". The rationale and assumptions for this schedule will be presented by the County Project Manager at the next meeting in order for the CAC to provide comments. Mr. Tischler will review the agreed-upon schedule, as well as UF's forecast of land utilization in their report prior to beginning his task and presenting his methodology to the CAC.

In order for Mr. Tischler to begin Task 1F- Fiscal Impact, the following work has to be completed:

- The suitability criteria must have been finalized and incorporated into the GIS maps so that all land constraints are known.
- A clear definition of the different scenarios of development must be developed and presented to the CAC.

Mr. Tischler expects to begin this task in January 2002.

Douglas Krieger

Douglas Krieger expects to present his work plan for the focus groups to the CAC on September 20. At that meeting he will discuss the rationale for the focus groups, the procedures for selecting participants, and review the topics of discussion. As soon thereafter as practical, he will recruit focus group participants and conduct the focus groups. The discussions will address citizens' general attitudes about farmland preservation and their reaction to the three alternative development scenarios. His primary purpose in the focus groups will be to identify the land use and farmland preservation issues that are relevant to citizens and learn the language they use to discuss the issues. This will help him design survey instruments that will communicate effectively with potential respondents and gather meaningful information about willingness to pay for farmland preservation.

Between now and the start of the focus groups he will work with DPZ, Patricia Bidol-Padva and the county to develop a sampling strategy, identify a focus group moderator, design a discussion guide, identify facilities in which to conduct the focus groups, and begin recruiting participants.

PLANNING WORKS

Memo

To: Consulting Team and Citizens Advisory Committee

From: Michael Lauer, AICP - Principal

Date: September 7, 2001

Re: Update on Land Use Suitability Factors

The consultant team is continuing to evaluate the significance of development suitability factors and requests the TAC and CAC to share their expertise on the relative importance each factor. At the July meeting, the CAC provided the attached initial rankings of development suitability factors. However, these rankings were submitted prior to meaningful discussion of each factor. In August, the TAC discussed the suitability factors. In October the CAC will receive the TAC's comments and will be asked to re-rank each factor based on the additional information.

At the end of this memo is a list of initial comments about each factor supplied by CAC, TAC and consultant team members. The first comment (*italicized*) indicates the best available method for measuring the impact of the factor. While repetitive comments have been consolidated, all substantive points have been included as a record of the discussion. If you have additional comments, please forward them to me through Jerry Bell as soon as possible so that everyone can review them prior to the October meeting.

The factors will be used to determine the susceptibility of agricultural land to conversion to non-agricultural uses in accordance with Task 1.a.(3) of the consultants' scope, but also will be used in the comparison of three scenarios – agricultural, rural residential and urban. Many of the factors have limited relevance to agriculture, but are critical for evaluating the urban scenario.

Potential Suitability Factors

Factors	Comments/Discussion Points	Avg. Initial Ranking		
		Ag	Rur. Res.	Urban Res.
Environmental				
Soils	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Analysis would focus on shrink-swell potential and permeability</i>• Existing soils generally are not a constraint or asset for agricultural development• Soils are not a factor for greenhouse industry• Key concern for rural residential development is soil permeability/septic system suitability• Key concern for urban development is shrink/swell• Basic consideration in all land use planning	4.00	1.82	1.45
Drainage	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Analysis would focus on flooding and groundwater depths</i>• Ponding and/or resulting elevations in the water table affect agricultural development and septic suitability for rural residential development• Drainage challenges may be expensive to resolve for urban development• Drainage patterns through the study area have affected downstream habitat areas• Upstream drainage changes have resulted in flooding in the study area• Factor is redundant with depth to water table and flooding potential – suggest deletion	4.18	3.91	3.73
Depth to water table	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Analysis would focus on minimum average monthly depth to water table</i>• Significant limitation on agricultural and septic suitability for rural residential development – see drainage• Affects housing foundations and flood potential	4.00	3.18	2.45
Septic system constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Analysis would evaluate depth to water table and soil permeability</i>• Primarily a concern for rural residential development• Key constraints are soil types (e.g., clays) and depth to water table• Affected by density• Repetitive – suggest deletion of this factor	1.55	3.73	2.70

Factors	Comments/Discussion Points	Avg. Initial Ranking		
		Ag	Rur. Res.	Urban Res.
Groundwater quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No readily available data for analysis Agricultural concern about shallow potable water wells See comments on groundwater vulnerability 			
Groundwater vulnerability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis would focus on depth to aquifer and soil permeability Concern is about shallow wells used by agricultural and rural residents. Recommend this factor be re-termed water quality -- this would address saltwater intrusion, drinking water wells and contamination of the aquifer. 	3.00	3.09	3.36
Well field locations and protection areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis would focus on defined wellfield protection areas. Municipal well field protection areas are a concern for intensive septic system use, some industrial uses and some agricultural activities How significant is agricultural well quality? Basic environmental concern is also water quality. Repetitive – suggest deletion of this factor. 	2.91	3.27	3.36
Potential for flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis would be based on flood hazards maps, though there is not much variance throughout study area Entire area is subject to flooding Urban and rural development can better control typical flood events Basic consideration for rural and urban development, though it poses periodic risk to agriculture 	4.91	4.27	3.91
Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing wetlands maps show isolated occurrences of this factor in study area Already regulated Recommend this factor be combined under the heading of Sensitive and Protected Habitat Areas 	3.55	3.36	2.91

Factors	Comments/Discussion Points	Avg. Initial Ranking		
		Ag	Rur. Res.	Urban Res.
Sensitive habitat areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat areas are not explicitly mapped. Wetlands would probably serve as a useful proxy Isolated incidence in study area Already regulated Rename this factor as: Sensitive and Protected Habitat Areas. This will reduce the need to have wetlands as a separate actor. 	3.36	3.64	3.64
Topography/elevation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis based on existing topographical data, though available map data shows limited relief in the study area More detailed contour mapping would be required to make this a very useful factor Most significant in relation to flooding and depth to water table Developers can build-up home sites Redundant – suggest this factor be removed 	4.09	2.82	2.36
Invasive exotic plant species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No data currently available to consultant team This environmental factor is a major problem throughout the State of Florida. Pest Control is major expense to agricultural producers and government agencies responsible for control/eradication. Recommend this factor be added. This does not directly determine land use, but dramatically reduces the profit margins for agricultural producers in Miami-Dade County. Suggest broadening to invasive/exotic species Are data readily available? 			
Air quality concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This compatibility factor could be measured as proximity to agricultural operations When residential areas are placed adjacent to Agriculture lands users often complain of odors, dust, smoke or spray drift. This intolerance for farming methods can work towards farming restrictions and more costly methods. The results of poor zoning, ignorance and lack of community planning. Recommend this Environmental Factor be added. 			

Factors	Comments/Discussion Points	Avg. Initial Ranking		
		Ag	Rur. Res.	Urban Res.
Water quantity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant team currently does not have information on water supply limitations as applied to different areas • An evident environmental concern with current and projected water restrictions that will continue to regulate all of our lives. Recommend this Environmental Factor be added. 			
Natural disasters/ weather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to find a method to quantify the impact of this factor on suitability for agricultural, rural residential and urban development • These events have and will continue to shape the type of agricultural crops and farming methods that exist in South Florida. Crop Insurance issues. Recommend this Environmental Factor be added 			
Infrastructure and Built Environment				
Road capacity/ concurrency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic modeling would identify capacity constraints for rural residential and urban development scenarios • Primarily a development issue and not in the interest of Ag or Rural Residences. Recommend this factor be removed 	1.82	3.45	4.64
Average travel time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic modeling would indicate average travel time/distance for each scenario • More significant factor for urban development • Rural residents want to live far from work • Take a Guess? That's as good as it gets. Recommend this factor be removed 	1.45	3.18	4.55
Water system availability and capacity, including fire flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to existing systems with capacity would be used to evaluate potential for rural residential and urban development • Primarily a development issue and not in the interest of Ag or Rural Residences at this time. Water Quantity already addressed above under Environmental Factors. Recommend this factor be removed. 	1.82	3.27	4.55
Centralized wastewater system availability and capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to existing systems with capacity would be used to evaluate potential for urban development • Primarily a development issue and not in the interest of Ag or Rural Residences. Recommend this factor be removed. 	1.27	2.82	4.45

Factors	Comments/Discussion Points	Avg. Initial Ranking		
		Ag	Rur. Res.	Urban Res.
Availability of other utilities (e.g., electricity, natural gas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to existing systems with capacity would be used to evaluate potential for rural residential and urban development Primarily a development issue and not in the interest of Ag or Rural Residences. Recommend this factor be removed. 	2.09	3.73	4.73
Proximity to Fire Stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to fire stations would be used as a proxy for response times for urban development and to determine the costs of providing adequate coverage What does this have to do with preserving Ag and the Rural Characteristic of Miami-Dade County? Also, Availability of Public Facilities and Services already addresses this factor. Recommend this factor be removed. 	2.00	3.27	4.45
Availability of schools and other public facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional service demands would be used to determine the costs associated with the urban development scenario Rural residents assume that they will not live near these facilities Hospitals, Police, Fire and Schools are facilities needed in rural and urban communities. Recommend adding : "& Services" to this factor in order to eliminate Other Service Districts and Proximity of Fire Stations as a stand alone factors. 	1.73	3.45	4.55
Existence of land uses that inhibit development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These uses will be identified to identify areas that would not be desirable for rural residential or urban residential development Primarily a development issue and not in the interest of Ag or Rural Residences. Toxic sites (Environmental factors) or incompatible zoning issues have already been address above. Recommend this factor be removed 	2.45	3.45	3.82
Parcelization/ subdivision patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing lot/parcel patterns will be used to identify the potential for resubdivision for more intensive urban rural residential development. Highly fragmented land is less likely to pass developers feasibility tests This is already address under the Political Issues of Zoning. Repetitive - Recommend this factor be removed. 	3.09	3.82	3.91

Factors	Comments/Discussion Points	Avg. Initial Ranking		
		Ag	Rur. Res.	Urban Res.
Water management facilities/plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>This factor is being used as bookmark until the consultant team confirms that the plans' impacts are addressed by other factors</i> Already addressed in the Environmental Factor of Water Quantity above. Repetitive - Recommend this factor be removed. 	4.20	3.50	3.90
Land acquisition plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultant team is trying to obtain information about funded land acquisition plans The Hole-In-the-Donut, the Frog pond and the Rocky Glades are all plans that have and will diminish agricultural production in Miami-Dade County. 	3.91	3.09	3.09
Easements/rights of way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High voltage power line, high volume/pressure gas line and other easements that could inhibit residential development will be mapped, as will any railroad right-of-way What does this have to do with preserving Ag and the Rural Characteristic of Miami-Dade County? Recommend this factor be removed. 	2.45	3.00	3.45
Proximity to transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion item 	1.36	2.91	4.18
Political and Market				
Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas with more intensive zoning will be considered to have a greater development potential Important to land values, affects transition of land uses, and requires good community planning. Very important yet very political. Recommend Zoning and Land Use Planning be combined and don't restrict zoning considerations to the effects of the Burt Harris Act. 	3.09	3.64	4.64
Planned land uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For areas where existing plans propose more intensive development than exists or is currently zoned, the model would presume a greater potential for development. If planned land use GIS coverage is not available, a zoning coverage will be used as a proxy and this factor will be combined with zoning If suggested changes to zoning are accepted, this factor would be Repetitive - Recommend this factor be combined with Zoning. 	2.91	3.27	4.64

Factors	Comments/Discussion Points	Avg. Initial Ranking		
		Ag	Rur. Res.	Urban Res.
Public land ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land that is publicly owned or funded for acquisition will be presumed to remain in public ownership unless there are specific plans for its sale Not aware of any no long-term considerations for Agriculture or Rural Housing on any Public Lands. Stiltsville and the Frog Pond are the exception to this rule, but neither are significant or representative of any sector being ranked. Recommend this factor be removed. Note: If the Homestead Air Force Base Redevelopment plans change this could be a factor, but highly unlikely. 	2.73	3.18	3.73
Development agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absent any new environmental findings/regulations, properties will be assumed to develop at intensities granted pursuant to current development agreements. Housing densities directly affect the rural character of any area and should be considered. 	2.45	3.18	4.09
Vested rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any already permitted or otherwise vested development projects will be presumed to develop As with development agreements, the study may recommend purchase of development rights under specified conditions. Rights are Rights 	3.64	4.18	4.36
Agricultural assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More discussion is needed to identify how this factor will be modeled Important to land values and expenses 	4.55	2.64	1.45
Corporate boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land within city's will be presumed to have a greater development potential Affects services, taxes, permits, restrictions and can either help or hurt various interests 	2.91	3.18	3.09
Other service districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This factor is being used as a bookmark until the consultant team confirms that all service district impacts are addressed in other listed factors. Some service districts may have taxes or fees that encourage development Recommend this be combined with the factor: AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES to reduce repetition and hair splitting. 	1.91	2.45	3.45
Crop economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Factors to be identified from UF study Markets, supply and demand, imports (NAFTA), packing house fees, processing fees, cost vs. benefit of various practices. 			

Factors	Comments/Discussion Points	Avg. Initial Ranking		
		Ag	Rur. Res.	Urban Res.
Housing market demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>This factor to be refined by Paul Tischler's work</i> Driving force that perpetuates urbanization and transition from Ag or Rural Housing into Urban Development 			
Employment opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>This factor largely will be addressed by average commute times.</i> The considerations of development and worker housing that were provided in the Explanation of Suitability Criteria are repetitive and already covered under the two factors of Housing Market Demands and Zoning. Recommend this factor be removed. 			
NAFTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>NAFTA is likely to be one of the factors affecting crop economics</i> Recommend this be combined with the factor: CROP ECONOMICS to reduce repetition and cut to the issue. 			
Contiguity with development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Contiguity with existing development would be considered a factor that increases the pressures for conversion of agricultural land to rural residential or urban development, regardless of existing zoning or land use plans</i> Repetitive. Already covered under Zoning and Land Use Planning. Recommend this factor be removed. 			